

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 28 2006

Remarks**About the Amendment**

The Amendment eliminates the reference to molecular weight for the non-acetal component, and instead describes the same in terms of heat of fusion and lower viscosity relative to the polyacetal component. Support can be found in the specification at page 9, lines 22-33 and at page 11, lines 1-4. The Applicant does not admit to the correctness of the Examiner's argument (that it is not sufficiently apparent to one of ordinary skill how to determine the basis for the molecular weight). The amendment is requested to expedite prosecution of the claims.

Traversal

Claims 10-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, for failing to state the basis for the molecular weight of the non-acetal component. The amended claims no longer refer to the molecular weight of the non-acetal component, and instead describe said component via the physical property of heat of fusion, which is adequately described in the specification. Thus the Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection under section 112.

Claims 10-16 stand rejected under 35 USC section 103(a). The Examiner rejects the claims on the basis that the prior art citations suggest the Applicant's claimed process. The Applicant submits that the amendment removes the basis for the Examiner's rejection of the claims. Neither of the cited references describe the amorphous or semi-crystalline non-acetal component claimed in the Applicant's process. Crystallinity is not based strictly on the molecular weight of a polymer, and thus a citation to similar molecular weight is not sufficient to render the Applicant's claims obvious. The Applicant has combined a polyacetal and a non-acetal polymer in a manner that allows the lower-viscosity non-acetal component to reside at the surface of the substrate, and thereby be a contributory factor in improving the painting process. The Applicant respectfully requests, therefore, that the Examiner reconsider the rejection in view of the amendment and remarks made herein. Applicant also requests that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn and a Notice of Allowability be issued instead.

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). The Examiner extends the reasons for rejecting the prior claims to Claim 17, citing in addition the Encyclopedia of Polymer Science. For the reasons stated hereinabove, and in view of the amendment, the Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin S. Dabson
ATTORNEY FOR
APPLICANT

Registration No.: 40,296
Telephone: (302) 892-5526
Facsimile: (302) 992-3257

Dated: December 28, 2006